REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,406,927 to *Pommer, II* ("*Pommer*").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant respectfully submits that the features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by the references of record. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Pommer*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Independent claim 1 recites a telephone terminal equipment interface circuit, including a diode bridge for rectifying line current supplied from a subscriber line and supplying the current to a call transmission/reception circuit, and a forward biasing circuit for supplying forward biased voltage to the diode bridge. The forward biasing circuit is connected in series in relation to the diode bridge. Support for these features is provided at, for example, page 3, lines 15-21; page 6, line 24 through page 7, line 2; and Fig. 1 of Applicant's specification.

In contrast, *Pommer* is directed to an electronic ringer circuit having a non-linear input impedance. *Pommer* does not teach a forward biasing circuit for supplying forward biased voltage to a diode bridge, as recited in claim 1. The circuit in Fig. 3 of *Pommer* shows a tip and ring terminal, in L1 and L2. However, the bypass capacitor C and voltage dropping resistor R1

placed in series and located along L1 cannot be the recited "forward biasing circuit for supplying forward biased voltage to said diode bridge, wherein said forward biasing circuit is connected in series in relation to said diode bridge," because C and R1 are connected in series to L1 and not to the diode bridge, and C and R1 do not supply a forward biased voltage to the diode bridge. Rather, the bypass capacitor C separates the AC line voltage from the DC line voltage, and the voltage dropping resistor R1, in conjunction with the diode bridge, acts to limit power dissipated in the tone generator. See Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 5-25 of *Pommer*. No forward biasing voltage is supplied either from inside or from outside of the equipment to the diode bridge in *Pommer*. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action is improperly applying *Pommer*.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *Pommer* does not teach at least the features of a forward biasing circuit for supplying forward biased voltage to a diode bridge, as recited in claim 1. Claims 2, 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and recite the same combination of allowable features recited in claim 1, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), of claims 1, 2, 4 and 5, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: November 16, 2005

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Registration No. 33,652

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202.739.3000